LIBRARY COPY

THEOSOPHY

A MAGAZINE DEVOTED TO

THE THEOSOPHICAL MOVEMENT, AND THE BROTHERHOOD OF HUMANITY

THE STUDY OF OCCULT SCIENCE AND PHILOSOPHY, AND ARYAN LITERATURE

Vol. XXXVIII—No. 6 **April, 1950**

WE do not look on this life only, but on many future lives during which "I and thou and all the princes of the earth" will live and strive for the universal redemption of mankind—ever looking ahead, ever seeing further heights toward which the awakening spirit may be directed. There is much strength, there are many faculties among men and mostly used without direction of a permanent nature. Could right philosophy be implanted—even the single idea of the Divine nature in man—a greater impetus would be given to right living; then a philosophy in accord with this nature would be sought by those so quickened.

—ROBERT CROSBIE

CONTENTS

MANASIC BROTHERHOOD....241
HOW TO SQUARE THE TEACHINGS....245
BELIEVING IN THE WILL....248
EGOIC RESPONSIBILITY....249
"THE GITA"—INFORMAL ESSAYS....254
NATURE AND EXPERIENCE....257
YOUTH-COMPANIONS ASK— 262
THE ORIGINAL PROGRAMME....265
MAN'S FREE WILL....270
"MERCY" KILLING....271
THE HAZARDS OF PSYCHOLOGIZING....274
ON THE LOOKOUT....277

$3.50 per Annum *35 Cents per Copy*

Edited and Published by

THE THEOSOPHY COMPANY

245 West 33rd Street, Los Angeles (7), California, U. S. A.

Publisher's Announcements

THEOSOPHY: Established November, 1912, by Robert Crosbie. Published monthly by the Theosophy Company, at Los Angeles, California, U. S. A. This Magazine is an independent Journal, unconnected with any theosophical society or other organization. The Publishers assume full responsibility for all unsigned articles herein.

SUBSCRIPTIONS: No subscriptions are accepted for less than one year of 12 numbers, but subscriptions may begin with any desired number. All subscriptions, orders for single back numbers, and back volumes, bound or unbound, should be accompanied by the necessary remittance. Price $3.50 per annum; single numbers of the current volume, 35 cents each; back numbers, 50 cents each; back volumes, unbound, $5.00 each; for library style binding, prices on request. *Volumes I and XII are out of print.*

COMMUNICATIONS: Contributions submitted for publication should be typewritten double-spaced on one side of the paper only, with wide margins, and copies should be in all cases retained by the writers, as no manuscripts are returned.

CORRESPONDENCE: Letters from subscribers and readers are welcomed, with criticisms, comments or questions on any subject treated in the magazine. Questions on Theosophical Philosophy and History will be replied to direct, or, if of sufficient general interest, in the pages of the magazine.

BEQUESTS AND DONATIONS: Gifts and legacies will be gladly received from those in sympathy with the objects of this Magazine when such benefactions are unencumbered and unrestricted. Donors should make their gifts to

THE THEOSOPHY COMPANY, of Los Angeles, California, U. S. A., which is an incorporated association, legally empowered to receive such donations and bequests in furtherance of its objects. These objects are:

(a) To form the nucleus of a universal Brotherhood of Humanity, without distinction of race, creed, sex, caste, or color;

(b) The study of ancient and modern religions, philosophies and sciences, and the demonstration of the importance of such study; and

(c) The investigation of the unexplained laws of nature and the psychical powers latent in man.

THE THEOSOPHY COMPANY
245 West 33rd Street
Los Angeles (7), California, U. S. A.

A U M

Children seek after outward desires; they come to the net of widespread death. But the wise, beholding deathlessness, seek not for the enduring among unenduring things. —*The Upanishads*

THEOSOPHY

Vol. XXXVIII **April, 1950** **No. 6**

MANASIC BROTHERHOOD

IT is the aim of the Theosophical Movement to increase the number of theosophists in the world and to diminish the number of sectarians. This is another way of saying that the purpose of the Theosophical Movement is to extend brotherhood among men, tolerance among minds, and self-knowledge in those who hold power over nature. A sectarian is one who, by intention or out of ignorance, has cut himself off from many of his fellow men; in extreme cases, from almost all other beings. The sectarian mind is alive to one segment of human experience, conscious within only an extremely limited radius of the full circle of existence. The theosophist, ever broadening his sympathies, increases the variety of human outlooks (besides his own multiple "minds") which he can appreciate, enter into, and coordinate with fundamental principles. The theosophist extends impersonality until he can find "points of agreement" with all those he contacts: he believes in brotherhood not as a sentimental dream, but as a manasic necessity. Theosophical brotherhood is expressed by the phrase, "The true theosophist belongs to no cult or sect, yet belongs to each and all."

Manasic brotherhood, it will be seen, is incomparably more difficult to achieve than mere fellow-feeling. Physical and psychic differences between men can be bridged by an intellectual position assumed, whether it be a belief, a dogma, or a theory. But mental differences, contrasting views, basic incompatibilities in habits of thought and interpretation—to rise above these, man has to seat his consciousness in his spiritual Self, and function from an exalted

plane of being, the Buddhic region of unclouded intuition and soul knowledge. Is this beyond the power of the ordinary human being? Theosophy, as the teaching of "living, human Mahatmas" who have perfected themselves in manasic brotherhood, stands as evidence that man *can* achieve spiritual harmony and overcome the barriers in the way of full communion with his fellows.

Since knowledge cannot exist without the Knowers of it, the seeker for wisdom does not *know* in a vacuum: knowledge becomes his as he assimilates the nature of its Knowers, for their "nature" is knowledge. Though personalities are infinite, and individualities legion, the Higher Self is one, and the more closely man approaches the plane of spirit, the fewer human differences become, until they disappear completely in the vision of the soul. The theosophist does not begin at once to penetrate the far reaches of ultimate truth, nor does he immediately encounter on the Path the Knowers whose existence he dimly realizes. Those who prate of "Masters" before giving due attention to the intermediate teachers all around them—their brother-men—are putting off the very recognition they so baldly desire.

The Masters of Wisdom, the theosophical Mahatmas, have plainly declared their willingness and readiness to aid humanity and every humblest portion thereof. They have caused their teachings to be made available, and their agents have painstakingly traced on the map of human learning the outlines of a new continent of thought: in the writings of H. P. Blavatsky and Wm. Q. Judge the Wisdom-Religion is most carefully correlated with all existing systems of religion, philosophy, and science. What does this mean? What else but that the theosophist, wherever he may be on the ladder of learning, is enabled to find the next rung and to move upward in the assurance that the way is prepared.

He has companions from the first—shall he belittle their accomplishments, ignore their simple need of help he can give? If so, he closes in his own face the door of progress. He would learn from Masters only, perchance, from great sages whose eminence he thinks he could be sure of? He has forgotten that the power coveted by disciples of the order such Teachers belong to is that which makes them appear as nothing in the eyes of men like himself. Those who

seek neither private gain nor personal benefit are virtually invisible to the self-seeker. Those whose love for humanity eclipses all other feelings work in the world unnoticed by the greedy, the ungrateful, the impatient and the scornful.

What, after all, is the teaching of the theosophical Mahatmas? Is the key to Theosophy to be found in books and diagrams, words, speculations, and learned dissertations? Or is the key fitted to the lock of the human heart, and ready to the hand of any man whose sincere desire is to open his heart and mind and set free the power within? That power can build the brotherhood that is the true "ladder of evolution," for the man of open mind has a universe of teachers. He learns to establish communion with the Knower in every soul—and to be charitable to that in human nature which is struggling for control of the separative self. No human beings appear as nothing in his eyes, and therefore he penetrates the subtle and inevitable disguise of the Knowers who masquerade, from time to time, in mortal garments. They have planted in the world some living truths, but these will never be discovered by one who has locked himself out of the collective heart of humanity as a whole.

Theosophist or sectarian—the philosophy of Theosophy does not minimize the utter cleavage between the two. Yet both may be, and are, present in all except perfected men. Affiliation with a theosophical group, as H. P. Blavatsky has said, "cannot make a Theosophist of one who has no sense for the *divine* fitness of things, or of him who understands Theosophy in his own—if the expression may be used—*sectarian* and egotistic way."

How is the theosophist to avoid sectarianism? By reaching beyond the usual affinities with those who think in the same way he does, and discovering affinities for as many *thinkers* as possible, no matter what their method of cerebration; by a readiness to abandon any fixed idea in favor of a general principle that will be homogeneous to a wide circle of opinion; by perceiving within a partisan view (his own or someone else's) the truth unfairly represented and holding to that perception as if it were the fabled Proteus, capable of rewarding with godlike gift the intrepid mortal whose vision remained clear through myriad appearances. Mr. Judge once went so far as to say that the student's *views* are of no use to him, and

"he had better be ready to alter them as he passes on." The formal expression of "views" is perhaps even less significant, for though his views will alter, it is his attitude of mind that should remain constant.

The sectarian, not the theosophist, is concerned with how other people are to be relieved of fixed ideas, for example: the theosophist is aware that every thinking man participates in the thoughts of the rest of humanity. The thoughts of others are part of "his" mind, even as his mental activity is inevitably and indelibly contributed to the vast, inclusive whole. "From birth to death," writes H. P. Blavatsky, "the least, the most unimportant unit of the human family exercises an influence over, and receives in his turn, as unconsciously as he breathes, that of every other unit whom he approaches, or who comes in contact with him."

If the world of thought is peopled by an unending variety of ideas, notions, superstitions, beliefs, negations, dogmas and theories —all represented in the different stages of growth and decay, assimilation and rejection—so also is the individual mind. Whether presently manifesting or obscured, whether waxing or waning in influence, whether corrected or still to be properly aligned, obsessive or controlled, the *elements* of the mind of the race are universally distributed among humankind. But this general identity in mind material, so to speak, is a fact to be rejoiced in—not avoided or deplored—for it means that each one, by bringing order and harmony to his own conscious life, is contributing to general mental or manasic evolution. The realization of unity with other minds prevents the individual from attempting a private salvation (that cruelest of false aims), and at the same time opens to him a constant source of instruction—through the workings of his "other" minds.

A Mark of Yoga

He is esteemed among all who, whether amongst his friends and companions, in the midst of enemies or those who stand aloof or remain neutral, with those who love and those who hate, and in the company of sinners or the righteous, is of equal mind.

—*Bhagavad-Gita*

HOW TO SQUARE THE TEACHINGS

PLACE has been given to Mr. Sinnett's admirably written article "Esoteric Teaching" for two good reasons: *first,* because he requested its publication, and *second,* because the theme is excellent and the time propitious. But by its appearance the *Path* is not bound to the conclusions of the learned author.

Roughly summarizing the history of the recrudescence of the teaching of the Lodge for this century, we find H.P.B. publicly beginning it, though guardedly, in *Isis Unveiled* as herself the messenger of the real Teachers behind. At that time (1875) she gave private teachings* in America to certain persons. Then in India in the *Theosophist,* with H.P.B. as editor, it [the teaching] proceeds to further unfolding in articles entitled "Fragments of Occult Truth." It is a pity this name was not preserved and used for the book which the "Fragments" afterwards became—*Esoteric Buddhism.* Later the *Occult World* came out in 1884, and also *Esoteric Buddhism.* During all this time H.P.B. was doing her own work with others, explaining the same philosophy as was given to Mr. Sinnett, and contributed to literature the *Key to Theosophy* and the *Secret Doctrine.* The fact—not denied by Mr. Sinnett or anyone—is that the letters from the Masters from which the matter for *Esoteric Buddhism* was taken came in the main through H.P.B., for although it is true she "showed surprise" to Mr. Sinnett on seeing certain things communicated to him in letters from the Masters, the surprise was not at teachings which were new to her, but surprise that they were divulged at all, for she knew the teaching, inasmuch as she taught it under pledge as far back as from 1875 to 1878 in America.

In her *Secret Doctrine,* availing herself of the same teachers to whom she introduced Mr. Sinnett, she corrected two errors into which she said he had fallen, *i.e.,* respecting Devachan and our companion

---

NOTE.—This article is Mr. Judge's reply to the article by A. P. Sinnett, reprinted in THEOSOPHY for March. It originally appeared immediately following "Esoteric Teaching," in *The Path,* September, 1893.—Eds. THEOSOPHY.

*Moreover, a considerable part of the philosophy expounded by Mr. Sinnett was taught in America before *Isis Unveiled* was published to two Europeans and to my colleague, Col. Olcott.—*Secret Doctrine,* vol. 1, p. xix.

planets. It is a perfectly unthinkable proposition to say that she was not advised by the Masters when writing the *Secret Doctrine.* I who saw many of the Masters' letters in 1888 in reference to the *Secret Doctrine* certainly cannot give up the evidence of my inner and outer senses. I know as surely as I know any fact that the same teachers were giving her in 1887 and 1888, as before, information for that book, in black upon white, and I am certain they dictated the corrections given in *Secret Doctrine* upon the points now before us. Evidence, eye-sight, and tradition confirm it, for in 1876 to 1878 I was given by her the same theories and the clue to the misunderstanding which a desire for consistency as to mere words has now aroused.

Even in 1888 it was *not the time* to make the point precisely clear to the public. Times have rule in occult teaching more than most readers—or writers—of theosophical books suspect. But the clue was given, a broad hint was thrown out. It is *now the time* when what I was told in 1876 and 1878 by the Masters through H.P.B. may be told, since the prohibition put personally upon me has been withdrawn.

The questions respecting Mars and Mercury—and I might add those which might have been but were not put about Venus—did touch upon other questions on the outskirts of higher initiations and which never are and never will be answered *before the right time.* The statement in the Master's letter to Mr. Sinnett that the questions put by the latter approached too near to secrets of higher initiations did not, it is true, refer directly to these questions about Mars and Mercury, but that does not alter the fact that all the questions then propounded on this planetary subject touched the delicate area; and whether Mr. Sinnett or anyone else liked it or not, attention had to be drawn off even at the risk of creating a temporary confusion on the topic. But in 1888 time had rolled on further, and now it is 1893 and nearer and nearer to another cycle. The clue may now be given. It may be noticed, if readers will observe, that the many questions raised in reference to Mars and Mercury served the additional purpose of so distracting the attention of questioners that hardly any queries were raised about the subject of "Cycles" on which the Masters had the completest information but about which the Lodge is more careful to remain silent than

in respect to other points—yet the cycles are more important and have more bearing on life than Mars and Mercury.

Mars, Mercury, and Venus have a special and direct relation to this earth and its invisible companions. Those three visible spheres have to do with certain cosmic principles and lines of influence in and on the earth, while the remaining visible planets of the Solar System have not the same relation. Read it thus, as taught before Mr. Sinnett was in the T. S., and as repeated in the *Secret Doctrine:*

> The unseen companions of your earth are united with it in mass, though different as to quality of substance. The visible planets of your Solar System which have a relation special and peculiar to Earth are Mars, Mercury, and Venus. But what that peculiar—nay wonderful—relation is do not ask, for we will not tell you. If while the current is open you persist in the question, you will arouse in yourselves a perplexity which the answer obtained will not relieve. Is there not a spirit of irritation, of rage, and another of wisdom and active judgment in man and Nature which may relate to visible planets which are not an actual part of earth's own special family? This is as far as we will now go.

The whole misunderstanding hinges on the word "relation." It was a word which led up to many things. The presence of Mars and Mercury in the sky presents a *relation* to the earth, yet they have another *relation* to it which Saturn, Jupiter, and so on have not, while the latter bear the same relation to us of proximity as do the first. Admit the proposed construction above given, and at once there is complete concordance between *Esoteric Buddhism* and *Secret Doctrine* as to esoteric divulgements. But continue the controversy to try and show that *Esoteric Buddhism* had not a single blunder, and perplexities of all sorts impossible to relieve will spring up on every hand. The Masters have commended the book, and well so, as it is made up from their letters. But that does not prevent one making slight mistakes, as, for instance, the one that all men stay in devachan for 1500 years. This is not the fact, nor is it according to reason. And I make bold to say that it is not 1500 years since I was last in devachan, but much less; and this assertion is made on personal knowledge supported by confirmatory statement from the same Masters. But it is true that the general run of the human race stays in devachan for the average time of 1500 years of mortal time.

Mars, Mercury, Venus, then, are a part of our system in the sense of having an extremely important relation and influence with the human race and its planets, and having that in mind it was quite permissible for the teacher to reply that Mars and Mercury belong to our system.

WILLIAM Q. JUDGE

BELIEVING IN THE WILL

Philosophers have vainly spent much time and written many books to prove or disprove the existence of free will.

It is equally vain to attempt to prove, by means of mere reason, the existence or non-existence of the will.

To believe in the will, one must *will* to believe. To know it, one must *use* the will; and to develop the will, one must exercise it constantly, firmly, and with a fixed determination of never permitting it to be conquered.

One of the best rules for the development of the will is, never to thwart it yourself. *Never say, even to yourself, 'I will do a certain thing,' without* DOING *it.*

But if our will is frustrated, does not unhappiness follow? Not if we are free from desire. Desire is impotent; it is only the *root* of misery, not the *cause* of it. The will is potent; it is a positive force and is indestructible. It can only be neutralized by an opposing will of equal force, and even though neutralized, its power remains eternal. If our will be enlightened by perfect knowledge, if it be in perfect alignment with the divine will, it must conquer in the end, and we need not be concerned about proximate results. While, if our wills be misguided by our ignorance, we need not be concerned, for we know that its effects will ultimately be neutralized when we have attained to knowledge.

If we free ourselves from all desires and entanglements of the material world, if we always strive earnestly, but never anxiously, for perfect wisdom, and if we constantly exercise our wills in the light of that wisdom, we shall make as rapid progress towards our final goal as it is possible to make. —C. D. HILL, F.T.S.

The Theosophist, April, 1887

EGOIC RESPONSIBILITY

Heard are the Voices,
Heard are the Sages,
The Worlds and the Ages:
"Choose well: your choice
Brief and yet endless."
—GOETHE

THE superstition that the total nature of man is continuous with that of animal creation, and that "primitive processes" have been the foundation of his higher life, is fundamental to most contemporary thought. The modern Humanist begs us to "recapture once more our sense of what it is to be a man," and he warns us that unless we now rebuild "our selves," all our external triumphs will crumble. (Mr. Lewis Mumford, *The Condition of Man*, 1944.) But where are we to find the new criteria which will enable us to judge how far we have reached man's estate, and to what extent our personal reconstruction is progressing worthily? Mr. Lewis Mumford's criticism of the materialist creed is that it confuses the needs of survival with the needs of fulfilment. He would like the best of both worlds. For him, there is an ethical principle behind the notion of his ideal of a balanced personality. It is contained in the conclusion drawn by Herbert Spencer, "that the performance of every function is, in general, a moral obligation." In all these humanistic studies of the present day, we are still in the realm of the Positivist philosophy of Auguste Comte (1798-1857), which recognizes only observed phenomena and rejects metaphysics, and points to a religion aiming merely at the victory of "social feeling" over self-love. Such systems are to be categorized as psychism, not as psychology of a spiritual order, as was long ago observed by H. P. Blavatsky. They are comparable with the superficial pessimism of Schopenhauer and von Hartmann in relation to esoteric philosophy, "the heart and soul of true Buddhism" (*S.D.* II, 156 fn).

The enigma of the age cannot be solved with this key. Perpetual choice faces man, and has faced him since he was made a god for good and evil, and became subject to reincarnation "in the higher

ascending arc of the terrestrial cycle." Behind all conscious choice lies the mystery of an evolution which proceeds on triple lines—spiritual, psychic, and physical. Without the coordinating factor of egoic unfoldment and control, it is useless to expect an accumulation of facts to crystallize out into creative patterns of meaning. This transfer to social practice of the dominant assumption of the natural sciences has rightly been described as "one of the most tragic illusions of Humanism." Altruism is not a by-product of physical forces. It is an expression of the spiritual nature of man and a token of his redemptive power:

> Let once man's immortal spirit take possession of the temple of his body, drive out the money-changers and every unclean thing, and his own divine humanity will redeem him, for when he is thus at one with himself he will know the "builder of the Temple." *(The Key to Theosophy.)*

A world fast tending to become maniacal, and characterized by hallucination, emotional excitement, and violence, is badly in need of an universal religious philosophy, "one impregnable to scientific assault, because itself the finality of absolute science, and a religion that is indeed worthy of the name since it includes the relations of man physical to man psychical, and of the two to all that is above and below them." Without this firm basis for thought and action, mankind is likely to fall into a debauch of irresponsibility, ending in psychic debasement under the twin sanction of theological obscurantism and scientific nihilism. It is one of the ironies of cultural movements in Western lands, deprived as these are of any noticeable influence from Eastern psychology, that while societies exist for the investigation of isolated paranormal mental phenomena, scarcely a glance is directed to the effect of modern trends towards the goal of "psychologizing" the mass mind. And yet, recent history is full of evidence as to the malign influence of mass suggestion and hypnotism, when these forces are wielded by ambitious and unscrupulous men in the interests of varying ideologies (the modern materialistic versions of the "Personal Gods" of the past), or commercial profit. Such efforts would be fruitless if men and women were responsible beings, whose evolution was ordered by self-initiated and self-governed activities.

It is for this reason, among others, that the Theosophical Movement of the nineteenth century laid so much stress upon the im-

portance of man's mental and psychic growth proceeding in harmony with his moral improvement and self-reliant attitude. For man has a divine mission on earth, and, to fulfill it, he must start with the realization in some degree that "there are external and internal conditions which affect the determination of our will upon our actions, and it is in our power to follow either of the two" (*S.D.* I, 639). Schizophrenia is related not only to the speed and conflict of material conditions but also to the inability to reconcile the conscious and unconscious psychological drives with the steady pressure of the spiritual soul towards perfection: "Like the *Vourdalak* or Vampire . . . the brain feeds and lives and grows in strength and power at the expense of its spiritual parent."

Behind the personal life, with its appetites, fears, and hopes, stands the Ego. Here is the incarnating principle which alone can make us truly man. It looks into the principles of things, and, in due time, sees the ultimate characteristics of both existence and non-existence. Not all men, we are told, benefit by the incarnation in them of the divine ray. With some, the power remains latent and dead during the whole incarnation. From one point of view, the truth of modern ideas may be measured by their endeavour and capacity to awaken the inner energies of the spiritual Ego. An expression of this Inner Self in the personal life is the sense of responsibility in all undertakings—the mark of a developed soul. Karma, in its metaphysical aspect as the Law of Retribution, is a statement of the universal life which conditions egoic existence, and which is perceived at that level as determining effects "along the grooves of their respective causations." Perversion could not go further than the attempts made by the moral murderers of our generation to find explanation of the highest impulses of man's nature in the behaviourism originally of a "gelatinous hermit of the briny deep" and his descendants. This is standing the Pyramid upon its apex. The real truth at the base of our nature, in its developing sense of integrated responsibility, was expressed by a Russian scientist of last century in these words:

> . . . the true cause of organic life is the tendency of spirit to manifest in substantial forms, to clothe itself in substantial reality. It is the highest form which contains the complete explanation of the lowest, never the reverse. (N. N. Strachof, *Fundamental Conceptions of Psychology and Physiology,* quoted in *S. D.* II, 654.)

On this statement, H. P. Blavatsky commented: "This is admitting . . . the identity of this mysterious, integrally acting and organizing Principle with the Self-Conscious and Inner Subject which we call the EGO, and the world at large—the Soul."

There is urgency in the want of the world today for a reiteration of the teaching of individual responsibility in face of the mounting crisis of the transition age. Both theology and science are guilty of emasculating man in this as in other respects. It is necessary to turn to theosophical doctrines for a valid sanction. With Plato, Theosophy dares assert, as against the superficiality of so much modern sophism, the truth that virtue ("virtue is knowledge") depends, not on fate, but on the character of the soul. "According to the tastes and dispositions of the individual souls, and to the degree of wisdom they have derived from philosophy or from experience, they make their choice, and this, once made, is irrevocable" (A. E. Taylor, *Plato*). It is because man has lost his ancient heritage of wisdom that he dwells in the darkened valley of indecision. A general dissolution of values has been a growing feature of twentieth-century civilization. The present phase of things was anticipated by Henry Adams in a letter written to Henry Osborn Taylor in 1905 (quoted in Mumford's *The Condition of Man*):

> At the present rate of progression since 1600, it will not need another century or half century to tip thought upside down. Law, in that case, would disappear as theory or *a priori* principle and give place to force. Morality would become policy. Explosions would reach cosmic violence. Disintegration would overcome integration.

To halt this process, the thoughts of men have to be turned from modern witch-hunting, vicarious atonement, and conditioned reflexes, to the ageless teaching of the responsibility of "the Manasic Entity" for the sins of the personality, "just as a parent is answerable for the transgressions of his child, so long as the latter remains irresponsible." Under the Law of Reincarnation and Karma, the Ego does not forget; "it knows and remembers its misdeeds as you remember what you have done yesterday," and it is this individuality which really suffers through the personality.

Once accepted as a principle of individual and collective life, egoic responsibility will gradually transform every detail of per-

sonal and social life, and our relations with all the kingdoms of nature. The implementation of this principle is governed by "an inherent law of progressive development" under cyclic conditions. A choice in small things and great is always before mankind and its individual units, and the results are as inevitable as the decisions set in motion. For the theosophical student, whose apprenticeship is served in the crowded mart, and who sees the mass of men walk waveringly, it is important to remember that "to have attained to self-knowledge is to have retreated to the inner fortress from whence the personal man can be viewed with impartiality." His own sense of responsibility will influence others, so that their preferences for the higher become less intermittent and more definite. And whilst desiring "only to sow that seed the fruit of which shall feed the world," his heart and mind may yet dwell upon the consistent teaching of adeptship and its hope for the future:

> Who is bold enough to say that the *divine Egos* of our mankind —at least the elect out of the multitudes passing on to other spheres—*will not become in their turn* the "divine" instructors of a new mankind generated by them on a new globe, called to life and activity by the disembodied "principles" of our earth? (*S. D.* 1, 309.)

Characters For Eternity?

There is no sequestered spot in the Universe, no dark niche along the disc of non-existence, from which he (man) can retreat from his relations to others, where he can withdraw the influence of his existence upon the moral destiny of the world; everywhere his presence or absence will be felt—everywhere he will have companions who will be better or worse from his influence. It is an old saying, and one of fearful and fathoming import, that *we are forming characters for eternity.* Forming characters! Whose? Our own or others'? Both—and in that momentous fact lie the peril and responsibility of our existence. Who is sufficient for the thought? Thousands of my fellow-beings will yearly enter eternity with characters differing from those they would have carried thither had I never lived. The sunlight of that world will reveal my finger-marks in their primary formations, and in their successive strata of thought and life. —Elihu Burritt

"THE GITA"—INFORMAL ESSAYS

On Everyday Questions

EARLY in the third chapter of the *Bhagavad-Gita* is found a passage of immeasurable psychological importance. "He who remains inert, restraining the senses and organs, yet pondering with his heart upon the objects of sense, is called a false pietist of bewildered soul." These words embody a conception of good and evil which is virtually foreign to most notions of Christian morality. The recommendations of "asceticism" in orthodox Christian theology, it must be remembered, are all based upon a tremendous and unquestioned first assumption—namely, that *any* suppression of the senses is moral achievement, regardless of motive and circumstance. Behind this specific dogma, of course, lie the twin ideas of original sin and the localization of sin in the impulses of the body. And, from the time when this conception of virtue—equivalent to a despising and flagellating of the physical man—became deeply ingrained in the Western mind, we have seen a constant and unnatural warfare between those who follow the doctrine sufficiently to consistently distrust life and those who, from one reason or another, *loved* life in spite of the influence of the dogmas of "sin."

Fanatical Christian ascetics—and there are probably a still greater number living today than is generally realized except by psychiatrists and theosophists—have established virtue as an equivalent of physical restraint. While it is evident throughout the *Gita* that no true virtue is possible without the capacity for restraint, and without its exercise at the behest of "mental devotion," nothing may be regarded as of superior morality which rests on a foundation of negation. But the fanatics have seen no other course of moral achievement open to them than fighting *against* sin. Even their almost inevitable succumbing to "pondering with heart upon objects of sense" while "restraining the senses and organs" has been due to the conviction that the senses and organs contain a persistent, malevolent power. Further, the man who presumably does "restrain the senses and organs" is not thought to be fit for the task of practicing full

restraint without the help of divine grace and the fortifying influences of church and ritual. An educator has succinctly termed this view "anti-life," while Macneile Dixon has said that "such men pay life the supreme compliment of regarding it with horror and loathing."

With this in mind, is it not surpassingly easy to see how the setting was laid for the Renaissance of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries? Though we usually think of the Renaissance in terms of aesthetic accomplishments, these might be regarded as but the accomplishments of a strong determination to combat every thought and belief which "disowned" a full and happy life. As has been pointed out by numerous scholars, the alternation from one extreme to another was likewise inevitable. The Renaissance was riotous, ribald, and crudely sensual in many of its forms, because of an unbalanced view which gave the pent-up psychic energies of man an over-valuation after they had for so long been denied natural expression. Small wonder, then, that what we presently call The Scientific Tradition has been accompanied by a prevailing opinion that *all* pleasant *sensations* are the chief desiderata of intelligent living.

On the outskirts of this struggle between men who "loathe the senses" and those who ask nothing more than to live in their realm forever, have been the many who have sought to bring some powers of reasonable analysis to bear on these two extremes. Therefore, much has been written about the implications of the word "sensual," and many distinctions essayed between "sensual" and "sensuous." We find echoes of this struggle in *Webster's International Dictionary,* which assigns moral failing to the "sensualist" and absolves the man who exercises a right to justly appreciate all pleasurable things in the material world, so long as such enjoyment does not involve callousness towards others' needs. These distinctions are theosophically sound, and may even be regarded as indications of the persistent nature of currents of theosophical thought.

It is of especial interest for theosophical students to note the emphatic attention given to this problem by Buddha, as recorded in the *Dhammapada.* Siddhartha, we recall from the legends brought to us through Edwin Arnold's *Light of Asia,* felt that the flagellants and extreme ascetics of his time had lost all claim to being moral human beings, so persistently did they despoil and debase a body

which should be regarded as a wondrously constructed and useful tabernacle for the soul. In the closing portions of "The Canto of Hell" in the *Dhammapada,* Buddha insists that not only are the thoughtless and heedless sensualists failing to exercise their status as divine beings, but also consigned to hell (or mental obscuration) will be all those who "see something to fear where there is nothing to fear," who "see as perverse that which is not perverse"—and who "see evil where there is no evil."

The energy in every impulse of the psycho-physical man must, apparently, be incorporated to serve the purposes of the soul. No "impulses" can be held in absolute suspension. They must either be expressed through action, or they must be transformed by thought in some way that makes action seem finally possible and desirable. No impulse may, on Krishna's or Buddha's terms, be considered *pure* evil in itself. First, every thought or impulse, however vagrant, presents us with much from which we may learn, and, secondly, every impulse is compounded of a score of conscious, modifying thoughts from the past, as well as a surge of emotion.

It is by the discipline of the mind through philosophy that we may separate into their component parts the "impulses" which move us, and relegate each one to its best sphere of expression. Some elements may be converted into immediate and beneficial action. Others must be taken to the plane of mind, if unsuitable for immediate expression, and there we may discover their relevance to the discharge of present duties "to all life and all beings."

"The false pietist of bewildered soul," inversely, may also include those who indulge in day-dreaming. Every man must be ready for the plane of action each moment of his life—which means ready to put into *use* all thoughts and energies.

PREPARING FOR ACTS OF ATTENTION

Restraint is the accommodation of the senses to the nature of the mind, with an absence on the part of the senses of their sensibility to direct impression from objects. Therefrom results a complete subjugation of the senses. Thus the mind becomes prepared for acts of attention.

—PATANJALI

EXTENSIONS OF EVIDENCE

Nature and Experience

WE are naturally surprised when we are told that physical events are undetermined, *i.e.*, not only that causes are unknown, but that they do not exist! Yet such is the new outlook in Physics.

No longer are physicists supposed to study the nature of the external world. They are trying to establish a rational relationship between the fundamental points of our experience. None the less, they still express their conclusions as if these had relevance to the essence of nature. The effect is to show that their discoveries require the world to possess contradictory properties. Prof. Herbert Dingle (who holds the Chair of History and Philosophy of Science, University College, London) suggests that all this is due to a change in this century that has come over "the metaphysics that underlies the physicist's practice," and he believes the physicist is largely unconscious of this fact. At least, it is something to find metaphysics admitted in the elaboration of physical theory. H. P. Blavatsky pointed out last century that the "Causes of Existence" would never be understood save by reference to metaphysical agencies, "the chief of which is the desire to exist, an outcome of Nidana and Maya," a chain of causation combined with illusion conceived as a cosmic power (*S.D.* I, 44).

Prof. Dingle traces the history of the new procedure in the special fields of relativity and quantum theories. He reminds us, in a broadcast printed in *The Listener* (London, Nov. 18, 1948) that Einstein, describing his work in 1905 (the year that marks the birth of his theory of relativity), and trying to explain the indefiniteness of the idea of simultaneity at different places, wrote:

> We require a definition of simultaneity, which supplies us with the method by means of which we can decide by experiment whether or not events are simultaneous. As long as this requirement is not satisfied, I allow myself to be deceived . . . when I imagine that I am able to attach a meaning to the statement of simultaneity.

Prof. Dingle remarks that Einstein was really studying the possibilities of experience, and not the nature of an "external world." He

might have added that our ideas, in both science and philosophy, on time and duration "are all derived from our sensations according to the laws of Association":

> Inextricably bound up with the relativity of human knowledge, they nevertheless can have no existence except in the experience of the individual ego, and perish when its evolutionary march dispels the Maya of phenomenal existence (*S.D.* I, 43-4).

Among the examples of the new "metaphysics" of modern physics cited by Prof. Dingle are those referring to what is known as "operationalism," and "logical positivism." In 1928, Prof. Bridgman published in America *The Logic of Modern Physics,* in which he argued that every physical concept must be defined in terms of the operations by which we determine it. Temperature, for instance, would mean not the measurement of the condition of a body by a thermometer, but the actual reading of the thermometer in a standard way. The main tenet of the "Vienna Circle" (later known as "logical positivists") was that "the meaning of any proposition lies in the steps necessary to verify it, so that any unverifiable proposition, such as, for example, that the event at A occurred ten minutes before the event at B, is neither true nor false but meaningless." The extremity of this view is to be found in the idea that the whole of philosophy consists of the analysis of language. In neither example is there a distinct abandonment of an independent external world; but the confusion is evident for those whose study is nature.

In the same way as Einstein considered only the processes of locating and dating external events, so Heisenberg removed the difficulties that had accumulated around the establishment of the quantum theory in physics after 1913, when Niels Bohr described an atom which could radiate in small indivisible units instead of continuously. As the steady electron orbital motions were unobservable Heisenberg said that we must leave them out of account and talk only of what is observable. In 1935, he arrived at his famous "principle of uncertainty," or "principle of indeterminacy." Eddington gives the principle as follows: "A particle may have position or it may have velocity, but it cannot in any exact sense have both." Prof. Dingle aptly describes it as equivalent to saying that one cannot open and shut a window at the same time: "It is a statement

about our operations, not about the particle, which might have been left out of the description."

The transfer of emphasis from the external world to the operations of the observer's experience is indicative of the confusion besetting Science (in common with other branches of human knowledge) in this changing world. But it is quite another thing to suggest, as Prof. Dingle does, that we should put experience in its "true" position as the origin of thought, and thus find ourselves unable "to ignore any experience on the ground that it is 'unreal' or 'illusory'." The reconciliation of experience with the external world is only discoverable in the esoteric philosophy, for "matter, after all, is nothing else than the sequence of our own states of consciousness" (*S.D.* I, 542). Add to this doctrine the conception that "there is no inorganic or *dead* matter in nature, the distinction between the two made by Science being as unfounded as it is arbitrary and devoid of reason" (*S.D.* I, 280), and the new outlook in Physics will be seen to be but a stumbling approach to the ancient teaching: "Matter, to the Occultist, . . . is that totality of *existences* in the Kosmos, which falls within any of the planes of possible perception" (*S.D.* I, 514).

As for the elusive atom, scientists will one day admit the truth of the following dictum (written in 1888):

> The atom belongs wholly to the domain of metaphysics. It is an *entified abstraction*—at any rate for physical Science—and has nought to do with physics, strictly speaking, as it can never be brought to the test of retort or balance. The mechanical conception, therefore, becomes a jumble of the most conflicting theories and dilemmas in the minds of the many Scientists who disagree on this, as on other subjects; the evolution of which the Eastern Occultist, who follows this scientific strife, beholds in the greatest bewilderment. (*S.D.* I, 513.)

On the "Subject" and "Object" Selves

Theosophical students will be familiar with the fact that *persona* was the Latin equivalent of the Greek *prosopon,* and originally meant the mask representing the individual god whose actions on the stage were the performances of the unseen actor behind the mask. H. P. Blavatsky made constant reference to this classical art in ex-

plaining the complex nature of *manas* and the thinking principle in man. The Greek stage, in the masking of its players, gave an inverted expression to an esoteric truth—the assumption of a two-fold attribute by "the *rays* of the eternal divine Mind, considered as individual entities":

> (a) their *essential* inherent characteristic, heaven-aspiring mind (higher *Manas*), and (b) the human quality of thinking, or animal cogitation, rationalized owing to the superiority of the human brain, the *Kama*-tending or lower *Manas (The Key to Theosophy)*.

A writer in the *Times Literary Supplement* (Mr. H. C. Dowdall) makes a very modern application of the doctrine, in an article "The Word 'Person'" (May 8, 1948).

After calling attention to the Biblical mention of God as no "respector of persons"—suggesting that St. Peter (or whoever used the phrase) was using "persons" in its then current sense as connoting "the occupation of a particular socially recognized status, as distinguished from the individual character of the occupant," Mr. Dowdall goes on to say:

> Thus, in 1900, Maitland commended to "the close attention of the modern philosophers" the problem involved in "the law's old habit of coordinating men and 'bodies politic' as two kinds of Persons," which, he said, "has become vastly more important in these last years than it ever was before," and, as this problem presents the theoretical aspect of the distinction between, and of the relation between, authoritarianism and responsible self-government, it is obviously much more important and urgent now than it was fifty years ago. But the modern philosophers have not elucidated it; and some lawyers think that psychology is better adapted to answer questions that are less concerned with the ultimate source of our ideas than the way in which we get them and the way in which they determine our conduct.

Just as the individual Ego reincarnates in a succession of terrestrial personalities, so do lawyers conceive of the same "person" as possessing many statuses, and so acting in various capacities on different occasions. Human law is concerned inevitably with the nature of man, in his individual and social nature, and with the motives that inspire acts—not actions. Mr. Dowdall points out that actions are to be thought of as reflexes of the nervous system, and as distinct from acts, which are the intended achievement of ends.

"The body politic" and "the State," and consideration of what Maitland called the "genus of which States and Corporations are species," take us into psychological problems of no mean order. Mr. Dowdall mentions that Sir Oliver Franks (late Provost of Queen's College, Oxford, and now British Ambassador at Washington) has said that the problem of economic statesmanship lies in "the distribution of initiative," and he notes in this respect that initiative and authority and government all mean the same thing:

> . . . and in conclusion it should be observed that a "person" or "subject self" is called by Ward (in his *Psychological Principles*) a pure Ego or Self, corresponding to Kant's "pure Ego"; and that a *person* or *object self* is called by Ward a *presented self,* corresponding to Kant's "empirical Ego."

Those concerned that theosophical principles enter more fully "into every development or form which awakening spirituality has assumed," can be grateful that recognition of the importance of re-establishing "the broken harmony between the two natures, the terrestrial and the divine," is not necessarily confined to strictly philosophical or religious schools of thought. It is indeed an essential plank in the self-redemption of mankind from the ills that beset it in all fields of activity.

Process of Perception

Man is a soul who lives on thoughts and perceives only thoughts. Every object or subject comes to him as a thought, no matter what the channel or instrument, whether organ of sense or mental center, by which it comes before him. These thoughts may be words, ideas, or pictures. The soul-man has to have an intermediary or connecting link with Nature through and by which he may cognize and experience. This link is the ethereal double (called astral body). In this are the sense-organs and centers of perception, the physical outer organs being only the external channels or means for concentrating the physical vibrations so as to transmit them to the astral organs and centers where the soul perceives them as ideas or thoughts.

—William Q. Judge

YOUTH-COMPANIONS ASK—

MUCH *is said and written in the theosophical philosophy concerning the "sin of separateness," and at the same time we are warned against identifying ourselves with the people and objects we deal with. This seems to bar both the front and the back door—how do we escape from this dilemma?*

The problem here would seem to be mainly one of words, our trouble being that we identify ourselves with *things,* and *separate* ourselves from the Real, which is just the reverse of the proper course. We have to learn to detach ourselves from things and people *without* separating ourselves from them, for we all exist in the great ocean of Life. We may draw closer to the reality in all beings and identify ourselves with that, without having to place our faith or dependence on changing aspects and manifestations.

And while we are on the subject, we might point out that the detachment of the sage does not result from a fear of entanglement, but is the natural result of the endeavor to seek out and hold to a "steady, constant and eternal" basis for understanding all things and beings. False ascetics of all ages have sought detachment as a means of furthering their own development. But they have sought to attain it by separating themselves from their fellows, and their very motive, being selfish, showed them to be still very much "attached"—to their own welfare.

Without a living body, can the mind still operate?

If by "living body" is meant some kind of instrument, the answer is no. But man can operate on other planes in other, finer sheaths. If he is to operate on the physical plane, he needs a form of physical matter. The mind, even, is material, according to Patanjali, and in the theosophical classification, Buddhi is also a form of substance from the standpoint of the One Absolute Reality. H.P.B. made the following statement which bears directly on the question: "Mind—whose enormous potentiality is being discovered more and more with every day, could produce *no* effect were it not material."

It seems that a person should put moral law above state and city laws, which are only external. If a law is not for the GOOD *of the people involved, would we be justified in disobeying it? Does race karma or responsibility lay any limitations on our choice?*

This is a delicate question, involving several live issues. It may seem a little like an evasion to point out that each individual has to assess the factors for himself and make his own decision, but this is particularly true in regard to such questions. For our idea of what the "moral law" *is* in any given situation depends on where our primary allegiance is laid. We can be certain that frequently we will come up against laws of the state which we are sure are not for the good of the individuals we happen to be thinking of—few generalizations are true in every particular case, and few laws can give justice to all individuals.

Some men by character and temperament are bound to consider the greatest good to be the preservation of order and regularity, the maintenance of a dependable and disciplined pattern for the relationships between men. This will then seem to be the most important thing to be preserved, sometimes even at the cost of an individual injustice. There are others to whom the principle of individual choice and personal freedom stands before all other considerations as the supreme moral law.

From the standpoint of the three fundamentals of Theosophy, one group thinks more in terms of the third fundamental, of soul integrity, while the other finds primary meaning in the first, perhaps, in the reality of brotherhood and of men's interrelatedness, and in the second, the principle of order. These two positions are not, of course, in opposition. They are, rather, complementary. But when applied by a man, they are inevitably colored by his dominant tendencies. A man may rebel without sufficient reason, or he may submit when he should rebel.

In any event, and whichever course he chooses, he should do it "openly and boldly," as H.P.B. said, if he thinks it the right thing to do, "and if wrong, never touch it at all." Take, for instance, the case of Socrates, offered a chance to escape from his unjust imprisonment. In attempting to convince his friend, Crito, that it would not be morally right for him to seek escape, Socrates gave

the State and its laws a voice and they spoke in this wise: "After having brought you into the world, and nurtured and educated you, and given you and every other citizen a share in every good that we [the laws] had to give, we further proclaim and give the right to every Athenian, that if he does not like us when he has come of age and has seen the ways of the city, and made our acquaintance, he may go where he pleases and take his goods with him; and none of our laws will forbid him or interfere with him. . . . But he who has experience of the manner in which we order justice and administer the state, and still remains . . . has made an agreement with us that he will duly obey our commands; and [when he tries to escape] he neither obeys them nor convinces us that our commands are wrong. . . ."

Some say that Socrates was unduly submissive in considering the state in this beneficent light, and yet it would seem that Socrates' idea of the state was quite beside the point. What he was saying was that he had no moral right to break the laws of the state *and try to evade the consequent punishment.* This is the position of any man who disobeys a law because it is unjust. He is concerned with abolishing the law, *for all men's sake,* not simply escaping its requirements himself.

Race karma and responsibility lay certain limitations on our choice, obviously. It is part of our race karma that we perceive this problem, in the first place. For many peoples, moral law is just another way of saying "the church's position," and very seldom, indeed, does the church put itself in conflict with governmental decree. Most of our western religions—the Quakers are one notable exception—are too interested in gaining membership to champion unpopular causes.

Sometimes we may feel that our responsibilities keep us from following the right course. But if those responsibilities are *really* our own, then the *right* course must lie in fulfilling them—though this fulfillment may be in a very unconventional manner. Actually, the only "responsibilities" which right action will ever force us to neglect are those we may be using to excuse our failure to face an uncomfortable decision and to take a difficult path.

THE ORIGINAL PROGRAMME

By H.P.B.

IV

TO continue: the charges wind up with the following remarks, so profound, that it requires a deeper head than ours to fathom all that underlies the words contained in them. "Is the T. S. a Brotherhood or not?" queries the plaintiff—"If the former, is it possible to have any *centre of arbitrary power?** To hold that there is necessity for such a centre is only a roundabout way of saying that no Brotherhood is possible,† but in point of fact *that necessity itself is by no means* proved [!?]. There have been no doubt Brotherhoods under high Masters. . . . " [there "have been" and *still are.* H.P.B.] . . . "but in such cases the Masters were never elected for *geographical* or other considerations [?]. The natural leader of men was always recognised by his embodying the spirit of Humanity. To institute comparisons would be little short of blasphemy. The greatest among men is always the readiest to serve and yet is unconscious of the service. Let us pause before finally tying the millstone of worldliness around the neck of Theosophy. Let us not forget that Theosophy does not grow in our midst *by force and control* but by *sunshine of brotherliness* and the *dew of self-oblivion.* If we do not believe in Brotherhood and Truth let us put ashes on our head and *weep in sack-cloth* and not rejoice in the purple of authority and in the festive garments of pride and worldliness. It is by far better that the name of Theosophy should never be heard, than that it should be used as the Motto of *a papal authority.*" . . .

Who, upon reading this, and being ignorant that the above piece of rhetorical flowers of speech is directed against the luckless Pres't Founder—would not have in his "mind's eye"—an Alexander Borgia, a Caligula, or to say the least—General Booth in his latest meta-

---

NOTE.—This portion of a manuscript article by Mme. Blavatsky was first published in *The Theosophist,* August, 1924.—Eds. THEOSOPHY.

*It is the *first time* since the T. S. exists that such an accusation of *"arbitrary* power," is brought forward. Not many will be found of this way of thinking.

†No need taking a *roundabout* way, to say that no Brotherhood would ever be possible if many theosophists shared the very original views of the writer.

morphosis! When, how, or by doing what, has our goodnatured, unselfish, ever kind President merited such a Ciceronian tirade? The state of things denounced exists now for almost twelve years, and our accuser knew of it and even took an active part in its organisation, Conventions, Councils, Rules, etc., etc., at Bombay, and at Adyar. This virulent *sortie* is no doubt due to "SELF-CULTURE"? The critic has outgrown the Movement and turned his face from the original programme; hence his severity. But where is the *true theosophical charity,* the tolerance and the *"sunshine of brotherliness"* just spoken of, and so insisted upon?

Verily—it is easy to preach the "dew of self-oblivion" when one has nothing to think about except to evolve such finely rounded phrases; were every theosophist at Adyar to have his daily wants and even comforts, his board, lodging and all, attended to by a wealthier theosophist; and were the same "sunshine of brotherliness" to be poured upon him, as it is upon the critic who found for himself an endless brotherly care, a fraternal and self-sacrificing devotion in two other noble-minded members, then—would there be little need for the President Founder to call upon and humble himself before our theosophists. For, if he has to *beg* for 2 annual shillings—it is, in order that those—Europeans and Hindus—who work night and day at Adyar, giving their services free and receiving little thanks or honour for it, should have at least *one meal a day.* The fresh "dew of *self*-oblivion" must not be permitted to chill one's heart, and turn into the lethal *mold of forgetfulness* to such an extent as that. The severe critic seems to have lost sight of the fact that for months, during the last crisis, the whole staff of our devoted Adyar officers, from President down to the youngest brother in the office, have lived on 5d. a day each, having reduced their meals to the *minimum.* And it is *this mite,* the proceeds of the "2 shill. contribution," conscientiously paid by some, that is now called *extortion,* a desire to live "in the purple of authority and the festive garments of pride and worldliness"!

Our "Brother" is right. Let us "weep in sack cloth and ashes on our head" if the T. S. has many more such *unbrotherly* criticisms to bear. Truly "it would be far better that the name of Theosophy should never be heard than that it should be used as a motto"—not of *papal authority* which exists nowhere at Adyar outside the

critic's imagination—but as a motto of a "self-developed fanaticism." All the great services otherwise rendered to the Society, all the noble work done by the complainant will pale and vanish before such an appearance of cold-heartedness. Surely he cannot desire the *annihilation* of the Society? And if he did it would be useless: the T. S. *cannot be destroyed as a body.* It is not in the power of either Founders or their critics; and neither friend nor enemy can ruin that which is *doomed to exist,* all the blunders of its leaders notwithstanding. That which was generated through and founded by the "High Masters" and under their authority if not their instruction—MUST AND WILL LIVE. Each of us and all will receive his or her *Karma* in it, but the *vehicle* of Theosophy will stand indestructible and undestroyed by the hand of whether man or fiend.

No; "truth does not depend on show of hands"; but in the case of the much abused President-Founder it must depend on the show of *facts.* Thorny and full of pitfalls was the steep path he had to climb up alone and unaided for the first years. Terrible was the opposition [from] outside the Society he had to build—sickening and disheartening the treachery he often encountered within the Head Quarters. Enemies around gnashing their teeth in his face, those whom he regarded as his staunchest friends and co-workers betraying him and the Cause on the slightest provocation. Still, where hundreds in his place would have collapsed and given up the whole undertaking in despair, he, unmoved and unmovable, went on climbing up and toiling as before, unrelenting and undismayed, supported by that one thought and conviction that he was doing his duty. What other inducement has the Founder ever had, but his theosophical pledge and the sense of his duty toward THOSE he had promised to serve to the end of his life? There was but one beacon for him—the hand that had first pointed to him his way up: the hand of the MASTER he loves and reveres so well, and serves so devotedly though occasionally, perhaps, unwisely. As President elected for life, he has nevertheless offered more than once to resign in favour of any one found worthier than him, but was never permitted to do so by the majority—not of "show of hands" but *show of hearts,* literally,—as few are more beloved than he is even by most of those, who may criticize occasionally his actions. And this is only natural: for, cleverer in administrative capacities, more learned in philos-

ophy, subtler in casuistry, in metaphysics or daily life policy, there may be many around him; but the whole globe may be searched through and through and no one found stauncher to his friends, truer to his word, or more devoted to real, practical theosophy—than the President-Founder; and these are the chief requisites in a leader of such a movement—one that aims to become a Brotherhood of men. The Society needs no Loyolas; it has to shun anything approaching casuistry; nor ought we to tolerate too subtle casuists. There, where every individual has to work out his own Karma, the judgment of a casuist who takes upon himself the duty of pronouncing upon the state of a brother's soul, or of guiding his conscience, is of no use, and may become positively injurious. The Founder claims no more rights than every one else in the Society: the *right of private judgment,* which, whenever it is found to disagree with Branches or individuals is quietly set aside and *ignored —as shown by the complainants themselves.*

This, then, is the sole crime of the would-be culprit, and no worse than this can be laid at his door. And yet what is the reward of that kind man? He, who has never refused a service, outside what he considers his official duties—to any living being; he who has redeemed dozens of men, young and old, from dissipated, often immoral lives and saved others from terrible scrapes by giving them a safe refuge in the Society; he, who has placed others again, on the pinnacle of Saintship *through their statues in that Society,* when otherwise they would have indeed found themselves now in the meshes of "worldliness" and perhaps worse;—he, that true friend of every theosophist, and verily "the readiest to serve and as unconscious of the service"—he is now taken to task for what?—for insignificant blunders, for useless "special orders," a *childish,* rather than untheosophical love of display, out of pure devotion to his Society.

Is, then, *human nature* to be viewed so uncharitably by us, as to call *untheosophical,* worldly and sinful the natural impulse of a mother to dress up her child and parade it to the best advantages? The comparison may be laughed at, but if it is, it will be only by him who would, like the fanatical Christian of old, or the naked, dishevelled Yogi of India—have no more charity for the smallest human weakness. Yet, the simile is quite correct, since the Society

is the child, the beloved creation of the Founder; he may be well forgiven for this too exaggerated love for that which he had suffered and toiled more than all other theosophists put together. He is called "worldly," "ambitious of power" and *untheosophical* for it. Very well; let then any impartial judge compare the life of the Founder with those of most of his critics, and see which was *the most theosophical,* ever since the Society sprang into existence. If no better results have been achieved, it is not the President who ought to be taken to task for it, but the Members themselves, as he has been ever trying to promote its growth, and the majority of the "Fellows" have either done nothing, or created obstacles in the way of its progress through sins of omission as of commission. Better unwise *activity,* than an overdose of too wise *inactivity,* apathy or indifference which are always the death of an undertaking.

(To be continued)

What Can Be Done

The Society must grow proportionately and not *too* rapidly, for fear lest like some children, it should overgrow its strength and there should come a period of difficulty and danger when natural growth is arrested to prevent the sacrifice of the organism. This is a very real fact in the growth of human beings, and we must carefully watch lest the "Greater Child"—the Theosophical Society—should suffer for the same cause. Once before was growth checked in connection with the psychic phenomena, and there may yet come a time when the moral and ethical foundations of the Society may be wrecked in a similar way. What can be done to prevent such a thing is for the Fellows of the Society to make Theosophy a vital factor in their lives—to make it real, to weld its principles firmly into their lives—in short, to make it their own and treat the Theosophical Society as if it were themselves. Following closely on this is the necessity for Solidarity among the Fellows of the Society; the acquisition of such a feeling of identity with each and all of our Brothers that an attack upon one is an attack upon all. Then consolidated and welded in such a spirit of Brotherhood and Love, we shall, unlike Archimedes, need neither fulcrum nor lever, but we shall move the world. —H. P. Blavatsky in 1889

COMMUNICATIONS

[In response to the invitation in the January issue, additional comments on Man's Free Will have been received, pursuing other aspects of the problem. More such reflections will be welcome, and discussion is also invited on the question of Mercy Killing, which is opened up by the communication on page 271. Directions for the preparation of contributions for publication are given on the inside front cover.—Eds. THEOSOPHY.]

MAN'S FREE WILL

AS to Will, per se, the first quotation we might consider is a definition from *Answers to Questions,* page 40: "Will is the *force* of any and all degrees of intelligence; it is inherent in consciousness as 'the power to act'; determination to act makes it operative." Expanding this further from the standpoint of consciousness, we read in *Transactions,* page 25: ". . . Occultism, unlike modern Science, maintains that every atom of matter, when once differentiated, becomes endowed with *its own* kind of Consciousness. Every *cell* in the human body (as in every animal) is endowed with its own peculiar discrimination, instinct, and, speaking relatively, with intelligence."

As to *Free* Will: on the same page in *Transactions* appears the statement, "Free will can only exist in a Man who has both mind and consciousness, which act and make him perceive things both within and without himself." Could we not then say that Will and Free Will bear the same relation to each other as do Consciousness and *Self*-Consciousness? While the former is inherent in all, the latter is only potential, brought on the scene with Man, the Perceiver, who then, as he progresses in evolution, expands (learns) further the use and exercise of Free Will—checked by karma (past wrong or right decisions).

(b) We can well believe that man is not a puppet of some outside force or Being, but that he does choose his course of action day by day and act by act. Nonetheless he is subject to the demands from and to others, these obligations having been incurred by each

one through past actions. These past actions constituted the exercise of his free will just as the present choices are voluntary although conditioned by all the past. We cannot separate Free Will and Brotherhood.

(c) It would seem that one of the key statements to be considered is "If, to any degree whatever, he presides over each moment of choice, then indisputably he has free-will."

The above holds true only if we accept the further premise that this is a universe of Law and that the real man, the continuing entity, is himself an indissoluble unit of that law. On the above basis, free will would not be interpreted as our ability to make an arbitrary will-movement at any particular "moment of choice," but rather would be a guarantee that all the will-force that has gone into previous "moments," as well as every decision we take as long as we *live,* will stand upon the firmest foundation that we could build for any life or for any group of "choices"—it would stand on Law itself.

"Mercy" Killing

The newspapers have recently been publicizing the question of euthanasia and proposals to make this practice legal. What are we to think of this? How are we to answer when it is argued that euthanasia is the only humane course when a man is afflicted with a horribly painful, incurable disease, kept alive against his will in a hospital, running up bills which his family will be hard put to pay when his suffering body finally exhausts its last strength and "natural" death ensues?

Well, I would start right there at the point where we are told that a man is kept alive *against his will.* I don't believe that it is possible for a man to be kept alive against his will. He may *want* very much to die (often this desire alternates with an equally fierce desire to go on living, as nurses and doctors have discovered) but if he *willed* to die, nothing in this world or the next could keep him alive. From the theosophical point of view, then, it is evident that the will to live still persists. If this is so, must it not be that there are lessons yet to be learned?

Suppose we deprive the man of his suffering instrument? His condition was brought about by his own actions—if we accept the doctrine of karma. Do we think *we* can absolve him from the necessity of meeting that condition and working through it? Are we not simply "transplanting diseases for future use," just as surely as the Christian Science practitioner does by forcing the illness back out of the physical body into the inner principles?

Always the supporters of euthanasia take a "horrible example," of course, in which case our human sympathies are strongly affected. But the basic implications of their position remain pessimistic. Is it not materialism at its worst to think that because physical conditions are bad—or, as they put it, "intolerable,"—therefore life should be ended, as there is no point in going on? If euthanasia were legalized, think how much encouragement we would be giving to *every* man, sick or well, troubled by some problem, to give up, because "he shouldn't be compelled to face such a disagreeable situation." What a spineless lot we should grow to be, with just a little more encouragement to flee from unpleasant ideas and circumstances and seek only the pleasant ones.

Does this seem heartless, cruel? Ask an artist, a writer, a musician, a helper of men, if he would want to end his life if he were to be afflicted with an incurable, intolerably painful disease. Such a one would probably answer—if he were a real *creator* in his art, that is—that he had work to do, regardless of how his body acted up. And even if he were so crippled that he could *do* nothing, his mind would teem with a thousand thoughts—are they to be killed, and would this be *mercy?* What visions might be his in the midst of the greatest pain, that he might communicate to his blinder, though healthier fellows! No, such a one would not want to go until he was useless—not simply in a physical way, but mentally, emotionally, also. And such uselessness would be the *result,* not the cause of death, for no one need ever be useless. But as long as people think there is nothing more to life than pleasure and comfort, they will ask for someone to give them these things, or put them out of existence when they are no longer to be had. This is the attitude that makes for a welfare state.

No, it seems to me that once you admit the principle of killing—any kind of killing—as legal, you've made a great mistake. Look

at capital punishment. War. Where do you draw the line? What about the Inquisitor who killed people for their soul's good—much more important than the good of the body, wasn't it? The Inquisitor didn't have his "patient's" consent, we are told, and that makes all the difference. But does it? What *part* of the person consents to suicide? Is it the real man, the ego, the soul, or whatever name we want to give to the individual experiencer?

What the individual does is between himself and his conscience. But it is not meet that the law of the land—or any outside authority—should step in and pronounce it right or wrong. No one and no thing but the man himself should take the weight of that moral decision. And I have the overwhelming feeling that even those who ask for euthanasia have an instant of clear vision before their death when they regret that they have "fled the field" . . . .

I would like to have this question fully discussed.

"A Swaying or Diverging Power"

Karma is not all exhausted in a single life, nor is a person necessarily in this life experiencing the effect of all his previous Karma; for some may be held back by various causes. The principal cause is the failure of the Ego to acquire a body which will furnish the instrument or apparatus in and by which the meditation or thoughts of previous lives can have their effect and be ripened. Hence it is held that there is a mysterious power in the man's thoughts during a life, sure to bring about its results in either an immediately succeeding life or in one many lives distant; that is, in whatever life the Ego obtains a body capable of being the focus, apparatus, or instrument for the ripening of past Karma. There is also a swaying or diverging power in Karma in its effects upon the soul, for a certain course of life—or thought—will influence the soul in that direction for sometimes three lives, before the beneficial or bad effect of any other sort of Karma can be felt. Nor does it follow that every minute portion of Karma must be felt in the same detail as when produced, for several sorts of Karma may come to a head together at one point in the life, and, by their combined effect, produce a result which, while, as a whole, accurately representing all the elements in it, still is a different Karma from each single component part. —William Q. Judge

THE HAZARDS OF PSYCHOLOGIZING

THEOSOPHY, as Mme. Blavatsky has stated with all possible emphasis, "teaches *mutual culture* before *self*-culture," and it is a prime feature of theosophical study that it points to a middle path between a would-be self-aggrandizement along spiritual lines and the hypocritical alternative of "saving" other people's souls. Theosophy makes a strong affirmation of human integrity, and this is the best possible preparation for one who wishes to contemplate new ideas fearlessly, and whose explorations of the range and reach of thought are intended to serve a common need. Strictly speaking, no idea should generate a personal or emotional reaction: neither fear nor possessiveness, neither anger nor pride, pleasure nor pain, are appropriate responses to motions of the human mind. But this degree of impersonality is impossible outside of a profound conviction that man's higher nature has an affinity with truth, and that it is characteristic of the soul to look directly upon ideas. Nor will the "salvation" motive disappear until the remnants of "personal-God morality" and the dogma of human separateness are replaced by theosophical principles of karma and self-propelled evolution.

"Mutual culture" means cooperative study of fundamental ideas, not an association for the purpose of "putting over" this or that particular notion. Theosophists combine their efforts to spread Theosophy, well knowing that the give-and-take in their common cause will tend to make each mind more porous to universal truths. Some cherished beliefs, hallowed by the religious materialism of the West, have of course to be given up, and this process is seldom easy, but it will be done as each one perceives the necessity and in accordance with his strength of will.

The principles of a philosophy based on Karma do not cater to the self-delusion which whispers to a man that he is essentially superior to his fellows, that their intellectual progress (to say nothing of their spiritual evolution) depends upon his timely assistance and corrective guidance, and that he is divinely (or karmically) appointed to protect them from themselves. Instead, Theosophy builds the conviction that respect for the free will of man (the

power of choice) requires scrupulous attention to the nature of one's influence upon others. Characteristic of the personal-God idea are its infinite and infinitely subtle encroachments on the integrity of man, and as long as a vestige of that corrupting dogma remains in the mind of the race, the theosophist must watch narrowly for its presence in himself.

The student of Theosophy therefore finds among the "lines laid down" an injunction concerning the tremendous responsibility incurred by "psychologizing" or "propagandizing." Just as parents, under civil law, are held answerable for their children, so Karma is said to "visit with hundred-fold severity one who deprives reasonable, thinking men of their *free will* and powers of ratiocination." H.P.B.'s words, applied to the incredibly ignorant charge that prominent theosophists (especially herself) were psychologizing those who came within their influence, are powerful evidence of the need for self-induced efforts in human evolution. H.P.B. declared, of those who would bring undue influence to bear upon other individuals:

> Verily the man or woman in the unconscious possession of such dangerous powers had much better never been born. The Occultist who exercises them consciously will be caught up by the whirlwind of successive rebirths, without even an hour of rest. Woe to him, then, in that ceaseless, dreary series of terrestrial *Avitchis;* in that interminable æon of torture, suffering, and despair, during which, like the squirrel doomed to turn the wheel at every motion, he will launch from one life of misery to another, only to awake each time with a fresh burden of other people's Karma, which he will have drawn upon him!
>
> What adept or even a moderately-informed chela would ever risk an endless future by interfering with, and therefore *taking upon himself, the Karmic debit of all those whom he would so psychologize as to make of them merely the tools of his own sweet will!* ("On Pseudo-Theosophy.")

One who has a propensity for over-persuading or "psychologizing" others into his own habits of thought, has a correlative fear of being himself propagandized without his knowledge. He instinctively retreats from certain notions he believes he cannot "safely" entertain in his mind, and his acute discomfort in the presence of a rival dogmatist is a byword. Which ideas are safe, in reality? Is there any idea which may not be warped or materialized—and is

there any incorrect or distorted version that cannot be detected by philosophical analysis? Which ideas in the race mind do we dare ignore? Who can absolve the practical theosophist from the duty of taking note of every idea his mind can grasp, and holding it up to the light of Theosophy—*whether he "likes" the idea or not?*

Dogmatists hunt in vain for mental pill-boxes in which to hide from other bigots, and especially from the baffling contact with a philosophical mind. The theosophist desires no protection from ideas, right or wrong, but is confident of deliverance from *bondage* to ideas, slavery to notions, imprisonment in dogmas. Insofar as the student is a theosophist, insofar as he values truth above all private considerations and in spite of personal hardships on the path of knowledge, he finds himself encouraged and upheld. Mistaken notions are not protected, nor false conceptions, however cunningly disguised—in the course of "mutual culture" these will show up unmistakably, for they will restrict his understanding of his co-workers and will interfere with whole-hearted devotion to the end in view. Nor can any self-advancement withstand comparison to service, which is the elixir of spiritual life. Aim, purpose, and method stand clear against the background of Theosophy, and the theosophist is protected when he chooses to safeguard Theosophy from himself, and for his fellows. The hazards of psychologizing cease to exist for him: he becomes a "karmic agent," not for other people, but for the Theosophical Movement.

GETTING THEOSOPHY STRAIGHT

All that any of us can give is Theosophy. We did not invent it. It was given to us; we stand in line and pass it along, as people used to do at fires in passing the buckets of water. People are grateful to the one who passes the "water of life" along to them, but the "passer" knows where gratitude belongs, and says: "don't thank me; thank Theosophy—as I do. It enables me to help others; it will also enable you." It does not matter what people think of "us," as long as they come and get Theosophy straight. There should be more and more come in closer, for the sake of Theosophy—new units in the body of Workers.

—ROBERT CROSBIE

ON THE LOOKOUT

Citizen, Agent, Spy

A cynical citizen of the United States of America might wonder at all the disturbance created by the recent trial of the American businessman, Robert Vogeler, accused, convicted and sentenced to 15 years' imprisonment as a spy. Regardless of the facts of the case—and how are they to be determined in the welter of cross-denunciations?—it is taken for granted by the sophisticated citizen that the U. S. will of course officially deny, with great and righteous indignation, that it employed American businessmen abroad as spies and informers to ferret out information in foreign countries.

And yet, putting aside the requirements on official hypocrisy, what reason is there to doubt—or be surprised or dismayed—that this is the case, when within the bounds of the country itself every man is officially expected to furnish the government information concerning the activities and character of his own neighbors and fellow citizens? We have reference to the methods used by the Federal Bureau of Investigation to augment its files covering thousands of ordinary U. S. citizens.

A Second Look

Time, in its commemorative story (Aug. 8, 1949) on the FBI's 41st anniversary, describes the Bureau as it appears to the "quarter of a million U. S. tourists who will descend on the FBI's impressive air-conditioned Washington headquarters to see for themselves how the FBI has grown." Further, *Time* unctuously remarks, "not many will leave without the firm conviction that Director Hoover's G-man is still the scourge of the underworld, the snap-brimmed symbol of dauntless justice in a covert-cloth topcoat."

It becomes necessary to examine more closely this "snap-brimmed symbol of dauntless justice." We are being forced to the realization that the G-man is no longer the simple criminal-catcher that he used to be. Dick Tracy, if the truth were known, is dividing his time between tracking down that gang of crooks and baby-snatchers and going around from door to door in a little quiet and

restful "investigation." Bernard DeVoto, in *Harper's* (Oct. 1949), spins a tale of an investigator's visit:

> The quietly dressed man at your door shows you credentials that identify him as Mr. Charles Craig of the Bureau of Internal Revenue. He says he would like to ask you a few questions about one of your neighbors. The Harry S. Deweys are friends of yours, aren't they? Yes, you tell him. How long have you known them? Ever since they moved to Garden Acres eight or nine years ago—or was it seven?—no, thirteen. Mr. Craig says the Deweys moved into their house June 1, 1935, which makes it fourteen years. . . . Do you happen to know what Mr. Dewey's income is? . . . So you say, look, Harry is district manager of the Interstate Gas Furnace Corporation and everybody knows that IGF pays district managers fifteen thousand a year. Yes, Mr. Craig says, IGF pays him fifteen thousand but one wonders whether he hasn't got other sources of income. How can he send three children to prep school and college, buy a house and a new Buick, and patronize Gummidge and Zimmerman on fifteen thousand? . . .
>
> Does Harry S. Dewey belong to the Wine and Food Society? The Friends of Escoffier? Has he ever attended a meeting of either group? Does he associate with members of either? Has he ever been present at a meeting of any kind, or at a party, at which a member of either was also present? . . . Where does Harry stand on the Bureau of Internal Revenue and the income tax laws? Have you ever heard him say that the income tax laws ought to be changed or the Bureau reorganized or abolished? Have you ever heard him damn the income tax? Does he associate with people who damn it? Has he ever been present at a meeting or a party where people who want to abolish the Bureau or revise the tax laws were also present?

"A Nation of Common Informers"

"I have hung this fantasy on the Bureau of Internal Revenue," writes Bernard DeVoto, "precisely because it does *not* operate in this way. When it suspects that someone is making false tax-returns its investigators go to the suspect's books, his bank, the regular channels of his business, and similar focal points where factual evidence can be uncovered and made good. . . ."

> It does not ask his friends or enemies to report on his wife's visits to the hairdresser as a patriotic duty. But if it did, would you be surprised? . . . I think you wouldn't be surprised. What is

worse, I think that for a moment Mr. Craig and his questions would seem quite natural to you. And this feeling that the interrogation of private citizens about other citizens is natural and justified is something new to American life. As little as ten years ago we would have considered it about on a par with prohibition snooping, night-riding, and blackmail. A single decade has come close to making us a nation of common informers.

"The Sack of Slander"

Mr. DeVoto's remarks make up in obvious sincerity and common sense what they may lack in measured judgment. The occasion for his outburst was evidently the climax in the trial of Judith Coplon, when presiding Judge Albert Reeves ruled that the government must either withdraw certain crucial evidence from the case or make its sources public, thus throwing into question the whole method of procedure of the FBI. Had these records—compiled from the researches of those "snap-brimmed symbols of dauntless justice"—been protected as "secret," and not been ordered into the record, a serious judicial precedent would have been established.

> The FBI . . . tells us that everything is properly safeguarded. The investigators gather up what they can and send it in, but trained specialists evaluate it, and whatever is idle, untrue, false, malicious, or vicious is winnowed out. So the FBI says. But we are never told who does the evaluating and we have seen little evidence that anyone does it. Along comes the Coplon case, for instance, and we find out that a sack has simply been emptied on the table. The contents are obviously in great part idle and false, in great part gossip and rumor, in great part unverifiable—and unverified. Investigator K-7 reports that Witness S-17 (for we have to cover up for our agents and our spies) said that Harry S. Dewey is a member of the Party, or wants to make the revolution, or knows some fellow-travelers, or once advised someone to read Marx, or spent a weekend at a summer resort where there were members of an organization on the Attorney-General's list. If K-7 is only two degrees better than half-witted, if S-17 is a psychopath or a pathological liar or Harry's divorced wife, no matter. And also, no one can be held accountable. If the same sack has previously emptied for the loyalty board of any government department nobody can be held responsible for that act, either, and Harry Dewey has no recourse.

"FIXING RESPONSIBILITY"

Mr. DeVoto comes to a conclusion in this matter which reflects a strong sense of the individual's part in shaping government policies —by his sins of omission and commission as much as by his acts of conscious citizenship:

> None of us can know how much of this inquiry into the private lives of American citizens and government employees is necessary. Some of it is necessary—but we have no way of knowing which, when, or where. We have seen enough to know for sure that a great deal of it is altogether irresponsible. Well, there is a way of making it all responsible, of fixing responsibility. As one citizen of the United States, I intend to take that way, myself, from now on.
>
> Representatives of the FBI and of other official investigating bodies have questioned me, in the past, about a number of people and I have answered their questions. That's over. . . . If it is my duty as citizen to tell what I know about someone, I will perform that duty under subpoena, in open court, before that person and his attorney. This notice is posted in the court-house square: I will not discuss anyone in private with any government investigator.

There is certainly much to commend this position—one which frees the man from odious "patriotic duty" without infringing on his real duties as a citizen. Mr. DeVoto's "notice to the FBI" might well be adopted by every citizen, not only as a code of public morality in dealing with government officials, but also as a private practice in his relations with private citizens. Were not the habit and love of gossip so strong in men, there would be no opportunity for the government to stoop to so demoralizing a practice.

A MISSING LINK FROM PAGANISM

Yet while here and there an individual may take his stand on consistent integrity, how can governments or people be expected to bear faith with this ideal unless the cynicism of materialism surrenders to a positive conviction of man's potentialities and a measured determination to arouse these qualities into action in and for all men? The official attitude, which almost recommends neighborhood spying as a duty of citizenship, needs serious attention, and readers who care to pursue the subject should consult H. P. Blavatsky's article, "Is Denunciation a Duty?" (THEOSOPHY

xxix, 348). H.P.B., surveying Western civilization in the comparatively idyllic days before the "Atomic Age," found that although "to listen without protest to evil said of *any one* is an action which has been despised ever since the remotest days of Paganism," the benign effects of Christian education and sectarianism had raised up a generation who *"dare not trust themselves* to abstain from condemning others—from mere force of habit." And, most serious of all, from the standpoint of Karma, H.P.B. declares in mid-passage, many cases of slander *"amount to more than murder in hot blood."* We venture to doubt that present-day students will be able to dismiss her remarks as irrelevant or untimely, even without the omnipresent FBI.

"THE EDUCATION OF WOMEN"

On the question of modern advertising (see Lookout for March), we found some interesting remarks on this subject in the *Interpreter*, a small semi-monthly paper edited by Mildred Jensen Loomis and Ralph Borsodi (author of *Flight from the City*). The *Interpreter* is written "for people concerned with the achievement of normal living through education and decentralization." Miss Loomis tells of picking up the *Ladies' Home Journal* for the first time in some years:

> I was reading a challenging bit from Dorothy Thompson on the struggle between Religion and the State; trying to decide whether I agreed with her that only religious people have the courage to withstand totalitarianism. It was difficult to follow her—and usually her writing seems clear and lucid. Then I noted that my eyes were repeatedly roaming off the page—to the left, to two huge, luscious Swan's Down cakes, one white, one dark, temptingly cut! To the right, a giant plate of sparkling orange and fruit cocktail on a vivid blue page!
>
> That was it—the advertising! Seldom do I read a journal with colored advertising; and I've schooled myself to ignore the black-and-white ads of newspapers. But the brilliant blotches of color—whole pages of it, 10 x 12 in LHJ—were doing their work. They were taking my eye, and disturbing my attention.
>
> So I gave it my attention—for a full hour, and came up with the following statistics:
>
> This issue contains 250 pages—actual book length. But of these 250, there was only *one* page of continuous straight reading matter, without picture or ad. The single page so dignified was the regular department on marriage, and it had a purple heading.

"No Ads For Books"

Miss Loomis' examination resulted in the following findings: of the more than 330 single ads, 76 were full-page; 104, half-page; 56 one-fourth of a page—making a total of 140 full pages or more than half of the entire printing space for advertising. Of all the ads, only one appealed to a non-material aspect—one for flowers, showing a gladiolus stalk. There were no ads for books, music, colleges, schools. The rest appealed of course to the physical senses. Miss Loomis concludes:

> There you have the predominant teaching of the above-average American housewife, the stimulus to her strivings and the distraction to her reading and thinking. There you have the abdication of the modern home to the dictates of industry and materialism.

"Normal Living"

Advertising, of course, only needs to *direct* the moving winds of our desires, which kama-manas is continually loosing in our natures. Advertising techniques are symptoms of our weakness, not the cause of it, and, as Miss Loomis suggests, it is—

> surprising how few of LHJ's advertised items are needed when one has a fairly clear and conscious philosophy of normal living, *i.e.*, that life should develop the whole person; that culture is achieved chiefly through daily human productive work and functional activities, rather than in leisure or the possession of many things. If one knows nutrition and body needs, most of the advertised desserts and tantalizing foods are questionable if not harmful. The drugs won't help and the cosmetics aren't necessary. Simply furnished homes stand more wear and are easier to clean, so the expensive carpets and curtains can go by the board. Human beings are so constituted that our physical desires are most insistent. Modern advertising keeps them foremost. But it can challenge us to question and refine our desires, instead of capitulating to every impulse of our physical natures.

Mechanical Brains and Mental Processes

The publicity given to improved designs of calculating machines has caused renewed attention to be turned to the old problem of the relationship between brain and mind. The likenesses between wireless valves and nerve cells have their own fascination. Neuronic

mechanics, as a new science, has been christened *Cybernetics* by Dr. Norbert Wiener, of Boston, and it is clear from the results so far made known that there are certain analogies between the arrangement of valves in the American ENIAC, as well as in Prof. Williams' ingenious instrument at Manchester Univerity, England (20,000 in the former, and 1,000 in the latter), and the arrival of impulses in a nerve cell through its dendrites and the behavior of neuronic pools. These parallels have led to the suggestion that the memory which these machines have in the form of stored charges is the same as memory in man or animal. All these discussions have persuaded some impetuous physicists and mathematicians to ask if we have not now solved the problem of mind. Are the actions of electronic machines precisely like those of the nervous system?

The New Vistas of Mechanization

To this fundamental question of mechanical perfection in relation to brain and mind—"the brain so finite, the mind so amorphous and elusive"—Mr. Geoffrey Jefferson, FRS (Professor of Neo-Surgery, Manchester University) addressed himself in the 1949 Lister Oration at the Royal College of Surgeons, London. His subject was "The Mind of Mechanical Man." He prefaced his remarks with a glance at the past, where we find that man has always dreamt of the possibility of building automata. Prof. Jefferson pointed out that the lesson of history and of the discarded explanations of scientists in past centuries, was that caution marked the wise man:

> We must beware of making science too rigid, too self-conscious and pontifical. A. N. Whitehead confessed to me once that he found that he had escaped from the certainty and dogma of the ecclesiastics only in the end to find that the scientists, from whom he had expected an elastic and liberal outlook, were the same people in different clothes. (*The Listener,* Sept. 22, 1949.)

In fact, as is so often the case, the new vistas are but the old ones seen against the background of technological progress. The first convincing assumption of mechanical "perfection" was that of Descartes (1596-1650), who believed that animals "were entirely reflex, doing everything merely because their construction compelled them." For this reason he thought it might be possible to construct an automaton that would behave not only like an animal, but, in so far as he was an animal, like a man.

A Chemical Engine

Mr. Jefferson stated that views of Descartes are very apposite to the present day, "which has become more Cartesian than it realises." But it was too often forgotten that even Descartes "could not conceive of an automaton of sufficient diversity to respond to the sense of all that could be said in its presence. It would fail because it had no mind." Analogy is not identity, and, far from thinking that the body is only a sum of mechanisms, we are realizing (Prof. Jefferson went on to say) that "hidden in the materials of which this body is composed are all kinds of biochemical ingenuities":

> It is a chemical engine such as would have astonished the mechanics. Give a man, to take the simplest of all examples, a beautifully efficient set of aluminium bones in place of his original skeleton, and he will die of some unpleasant blood disease because bones are living organs as well as props.

But the transference of the fundamental problem from the field of the mechanicalist to that of the biochemist solves nothing. Admitting that the brain remains itself and unique in Nature, however its functions may be mimicked by machines, we find Prof. Jefferson agreeing that science today is completely ignorant of the point in the evolutionary scale at which mind appeared for the first time.

The Denial of Soul

The dust of the nineteenth century conflict between the theological view of man as a special creation, and the scientific conception of him as simply a creature of habit and environment, still obscures contemporary thought. It is true that Descartes placed an immaterial mind in the pineal gland, and, unscientific as this appears to be to Prof. Jefferson (along with the phlogiston theory of fevers, which he mentions) yet in this Descartes was "far nearer the occult truth than is any Haeckel" (*S.D.* II, 298). In the main, however, we continue to be obsessed by Aristotelian categories, and most of us are tempted to see differences when we should be exploring unities. It is here, in the refusal to endow (as Leibnitz and the occultists do) "the whole creation with mental life . . . capable of infinite gradations" (*S.D.* I, 627), that confusion arises. On this point, Prof. Jefferson has a pertinent observation:

> We should not show any hesitation in attributing conscious mental processes to animals today. Greatly though information has increased, the field study of animals in their natural state is with difficulty pursued over long periods, so that we have but short chapters from their lives, and some are too shy, too evasive, or too episodic in their sojourns to allow of continuous recording. We should find great difficulty in grading animal minds. Such knowledge as we have is enough to teach us that even among creatures of the same genera there are great differences in the cleverness of individuals. There are not only clever dogs and dull ones, but clever hens and stupid hens, attractive hens (to the cock) and plain ones, and, for all we know, clever and lovely flies, clever elephants, clever snake and fish, with dull-witted brothers and ugly sisters. Obstinacy, no doubt, varies in the mule.

Prof. Jefferson mentions that Wiener (see Lookout, March and August 1949) makes much of the similarity between the functional illness of ENIAC and the methods employed in curing obsessional diseases (by narcosis or leucotomy, for instance); but he warns strongly against the dangers of fantasy in this connection. "If we see that some nervous tissues behave like some electronic circuits," he remarks, "we must all the time remember that the resemblance is with fragments of the nervous system and not with the whole integrated nervous system of man."

Body and Psyche

Most Western psychologists and physiologists refuse to recognize that "the body is simply the irresponsible organ, the tool of the *psyche*. if not of the 'spiritual man'" (*S.D.* II, 302). Stalwart empiricists, they stand by the method of seeing whether some idea can be substantiated by physical experiment. They are interested in formulae, and the so-called Laws of Science are no more than (to use Prof. Jefferson's phrase) "science recollected in tranquillity." For them, the contrast of Subject and Object, through the employment of the senses, still endures, as indeed does Descartes' mutually irreducible Extension and Thought. Hence the continued fascination of the futile pursuit of mind in a mechanical brain. To all such we commend the words of a great Teacher:

> Physical science is welcome to speculate upon the physiological mechanism of living beings, and to continue her fruitless efforts in trying to resolve our feelings, our sensations, mental and spiritual, into functions of their inorganic vehicles. Nevertheless, all that

> will ever be accomplished in this direction has already been done, and Science will go no farther. She is before a dead wall, on the face of which she traces, as she imagines, great physiological and psychic discoveries, but every one of which will be shown later on to be no better than the cobwebs spun by her scientific fancies and illusions. The tissues of our objective framework alone are subservient to the analysis and researches of physiological science. The six higher principles in them will evade for ever the hand that is guided by an animus that purposely ignores and rejects the Occult Sciences. (*S.D.* I, 133-4.)

BIRTH AND THE MOON

From far back in pagan times has persisted the "superstition" (indulgently smiled on by modern physicians as a harmless old-wives' tale) linking conception, gestation and birth with the phases of the moon. Now it is again becoming respectable, it seems, to mention this possible connection. Dr. William S. Barton reports a six-year study of obstetrical records at the Methodist Hospital of Southern California, where charts compiled by a hospital statistician revealed that more babies are delivered during the waxing moon than in the waning cycle.

> "For some time," admitted Walter R. Hoefflin Jr., the hospital administrator, "the activities of our obstetrical department have been guided to an important extent by the moon. . . . But we didn't want to say anything about it until Mr. Jackson had completed his six-year survey. His charts and graphs disclose that in 62 of 72 complete lunar cycles (28-29 days), this mystifying rule was authenticated." . . .
>
> On the basis of the findings, more nurses are assigned during lunar periods when there is the greatest likelihood that the delivery room and nurseries will be crowded. Also, any refurbishing such as painting and varnishing is scheduled during waning moons when there is the least chance of overcrowding.

"AN UNKNOWN IRRITANT?"

Neither Administrator Hoefflin nor Mr. Jackson have any explanation for this phenomenon, the Los Angeles *Times* report (March 5) continues. "It could relate," Hoefflin said, "to the lunar cycle at conception. Or, we may speculate that a waxing moon is related to some unknown irritant."

H. P. Blavatsky, in *Isis Unveiled,* adds a few more questions to these, pointing to the reality of sidereal influences. She asks representatives of science "whether they can explain *why* the tides follow the moon in her circling motion?"

> The fact is, they cannot demonstrate even so familiar a phenomenon as this, one that has no mystery for even the neophytes in alchemy and magic. We would also like to learn whether they are equally incapable of telling us why the moon's rays are so poisonous, even fatal, to some organisms; why in some parts of Africa and India a person sleeping in the moonlight is often made insane; why the crises of certain diseases correspond with lunar changes; why somnambulists are more affected at her full; and why gardeners, farmers, and woodmen cling so tenaciously to the idea that vegetation is affected by lunar influences? . . .
>
> Thus if science cannot explain the cause of this physical influence, what can she know of the moral and occult influences that may be exercised by the celestial bodies on men and their destiny; and why contradict that which it is impossible for her to prove false? If certain aspects of the moon effect tangible results so familiar in the experience of men throughout all time, what violence are we doing to logic in assuming the possibility that a certain combination of sidereal influences may also be more or less potential?

When science comes, in a real sense, to a consideration of such a possibility, it will need as a corollary the perception that behind every form is an intelligent being of some kind, and that, for every planet, its inhabiting humanity goes to form such a "being," whose influence must extend to all other beings. More specific Theosophical teachings concerning the moon are given in H.P.B.'s *Secret Doctrine.* Students who have an opportunity to follow up some of the entries under "Moon" in the separate *Secret Doctrine Index,* will appreciate why man's present mode of incarnation is presided over by the earth's own parent globe.

"The Bitter Herb"

The *Ladies' Home Journal* for February carries a long novel about people who believe that life is to be *lived*—not glamourized nor dramatized, neither escaped, belittled, nor feared. The strongest character in the story is a woman without vanity, who disdains ordinary reactions to a difficult situation, and instead of spreading

exasperation and discouragement by "extroversion" or "introversion," continues with duties at hand and leaves her higher "senses" to adjust her attitude of mind. For the privilege of meeting a person of rare discernment and fundamental kindness, the reader of "The Bitter Herb" will be grateful to its author, Nelia Gardner White.

"Nan Broome," like all who value integrity, is too discerning to be victimized by gossip, but even if her own life (through her husband's friendship with another woman) had not been complicated by the spreading evil of malicious asides, one feels that she would have continued to quench idle calumnies and vicious rumors, for the sake of the community as a whole. Her refusal to accept disparagements of others is shown with its natural corollary—an unfailing instinct for the right word, the thoughtful act, the critically-needed encouragement.

"SMALL SECRET GRIN"

This story would be lost in summary, its reality and power being in the cast and not in the plot, although the train of events is unusual. In theosophical terms, the main characters work off a karmic debt, and as the situation enters its acute or climactic phase, Nan Broome gives a typical salute:

> *I'll either die of this, or in the end it just won't matter any more,* she told herself, then gave a small secret grin. *I expect I won't die and that it will still matter,* she admitted.

The determination to do what is necessary, relegating personal distaste to the background, is beautifully (which is to say intelligently) portrayed, and the "bitter herb" proves itself—as courage, honesty, self-reliance, and stamina. Infinitely more precious and durable than its more popular emotional imitation is the love that keeps the Broome family together—a bond made of a thousand strands of daily patience, trust, and self-mastery. The fabulous divorce rate in our country shows with painful clarity how little the idea of self-discipline is connected with marriage, people seeming to expect that marriage is to make them happy, rather than that they are to make marriage *work*.

THE UNITED LODGE OF THEOSOPHISTS

DECLARATION

The policy of this Lodge is independent devotion to the cause of Theosophy, without professing attachment to any Theosophical organization. It is loyal to the great Founders of the Theosophical Movement, but does not concern itself with dissensions or differences of individual opinion.

The work it has on hand and the end it keeps in view are too absorbing and too lofty to leave it the time or inclination to take part in side issues. That work and that end is the dissemination of the Fundamental Principles of the philosophy of Theosophy, and the exemplification in practice of those principles, through a truer realization of the SELF; a profounder conviction of Universal Brotherhood.

It holds that the unassailable basis for union among Theosophists, wherever and however situated, is "similarity of aim, purpose and teaching," and therefore has neither Constitution, By-Laws nor Officers, the sole bond between its Associates being that basis. And it aims to disseminate this idea among Theosophists in the furtherance of Unity.

It regards as Theosophists all who are engaged in the true service of Humanity, without distinction of race, creed, sex, condition or organization, and

It welcomes to its association all those who are in accord with its declared purposes and who desire to fit themselves, by study and otherwise, to be the better able to help and teach others.

"The true Theosophist belongs to no cult or sect; yet belongs to each and all."

Being in sympathy with the purposes of this Lodge, as set forth in its "Declaration," I hereby record my desire to be enrolled as an Associate, it being understood that such association calls for no obligation on my part, other than that which I, myself, determine.

The foregoing is the form signed by Associates of the United Lodge of Theosophists. Inquiries are invited from all persons to whom this Movement may appeal. Cards for signatures will be sent upon request, and every possible assistance furnished Associates in their studies and in efforts to form local Lodges. There are no fees of any kind, and no formalities to be complied with. Write to:

GENERAL REGISTRAR, UNITED LODGE OF THEOSOPHISTS,
Theosophy Hall, 33rd and Grand Ave., Los Angeles (7), Calif.

U. L. T. LODGES

AMSTERDAM, C. HOLLAND.....Keizersgracht 411
BANGALORE CITY, INDIA.....15 Sir Krishna Rao Rd., Basavangudi
BERKELEY (4), CALIFORNIA.....Masonic Temple Bldg., Bancroft and Shattuck
BOMBAY, INDIA.....51 Mahatma Gandhi Road
LONDON (W. 1), ENGLAND.....17 Great Cumberland Place
LONDON, ONTARIO, CANADA.....424 Richmond Street
LOS ANGELES (7), CALIFORNIA.....245 West 33rd Street
MATUNGA, BOMBAY (19), INDIA.....Anandi Nivas, Bhaudaji Road
NEW YORK CITY (22).....22 East Sixtieth Street
PARIS (5), FRANCE.....14 Rue de l'Abbé de l'Epée
PHILADELPHIA (3), PENNSYLVANIA.....1917 Walnut Street
PHOENIX, ARIZONA.....32 North Central Avenue
SACRAMENTO (16), CALIFORNIA.....720 Alhambra Boulevard
SAN DIEGO (1), CALIFORNIA.....307 Orpheum Theatre Bldg., 524 B Street
SAN FRANCISCO (3), CALIFORNIA.....860 Pacific Bldg., 4th and Market Streets
SAN LEANDRO, CALIFORNIA.....1543 Morgan Avenue
SYDNEY, AUSTRALIA.....Federation House, 166 Phillip Street
WASHINGTON (8), D. C.....2653 Connecticut Ave., N. W.

THEOSOPHICAL PUBLICATIONS

Books by H. P. Blavatsky:

Isis Unveiled, a photographic facsimile of the Original Edition, the two volumes bound in one	$ 7.50
The Secret Doctrine, facsimile edition, two volumes in one	8.50
Index to the Secret Doctrine, for students	3.00
The Secret Doctrine *and* Index	11.00
The Key to Theosophy, facsimile of Original Edition	3.00
Theosophical Glossary, facsimile of Original Edition	3.00
Transactions of the Blavatsky Lodge	2.50
The Voice of the Silence	1.50

Books by William Q. Judge:

The Ocean of Theosophy	2.00
Letters That Have Helped Me, new and enlarged edition	3.00
The Bhagavad-Gita	1.50
Notes on the Bhagavad-Gita	1.50
Patanjali's Yoga Aphorisms	1.50

Other Books:

The Friendly Philosopher, Letters and Talks by Robert Crosbie	3.00
Answers to Questions on the "Ocean," by Robert Crosbie	2.00
The Eternal Verities, for children, new edition	2.00
Teacher's Manual and Guide to the "Eternal Verities"	2.50
"Because—" for the Children Who Ask Why	2.00
Light on the Path, written down by "M.C." (Bombay Ed.)	.75
Through the Gates of Gold, written down by "M.C."	1.50
Occult Tales, by H. P. Blavatsky and Wm. Q. Judge	2.00
From the Book of Images, a volume of Indian tales	3.00

Pamphlets:

Theosophy Simply Stated (10 copies, 50 cents; 50 copies, $2.00)	.10
Conversations on Theosophy, including the "Three Fundamental Propositions" of the Secret Doctrine	.10
Reincarnation and Karma, containing the "Aphorisms on Karma" by William Q. Judge	.10
Thoughts for Thinkers, a helpful essay	.10
What is Death?	.10
The Vocation of Life	.10
The United Lodge of Theosophists, a statement of its history, purpose and methods	.25
Five Messages to American Theosophists, by H. P. Blavatsky	.25
Epitome of Theosophy, by William Q. Judge	.25
Echoes from the Orient, by William Q. Judge	.25
Moral Education, new and enlarged edition	.50
A Christian and a Theosophist	.25
The Laws of Healing, Physical and Metaphysical	.50
States After Death, and Spiritualistic "Communications" Explained	.35
Cycles of Psychism, The Import of Psychic Evolution	.50
Hypnotism—a Psychic Malpractice	.25

Prices subject to change without notice

Correspondence, orders, etc., should be addressed to

THE THEOSOPHY COMPANY

245 West 33rd Street, Los Angeles (7), California

22-24 East 60th Street, New York (22), New York